

**RE: UC - EPA vermiculite data request - response 11122010**

**Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)** to: Benson.Bob

11/29/2010 11:48 AM

From: "Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)" <HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>

To:

---

Bob, We'll have the CHEEC values to you shortly. The reason for the delay was that we discovered an error in the Exposure Matrix for 1977. So we will be sending you an updated Exposure Matrix, CHEEC values from 2004 and CHEEC values from 1980. We are also nearly done making the requested edits to the Decision Points document. Do you have the same time constraints for that as well?

Tim

-----Original Message-----

From: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov

[mailto:Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 10:43 AM

To: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)

Cc: Borton, Eric (bortonek); brattin@srcinc.com; Lemasters, Grace (lemastgj); Lockey, James (lockeyje); Rice, Carol (ricech)

Subject: RE: UC - EPA vermiculite data request - response 11122010

Thank you for the clarification on 17352 and 17847 and the information

on x-ray improvements.

Can you provide an estimate of when the 1980 CHEEC values will be available? We are scheduled to do a briefing for Superfund management in

DC next week.

From: "Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)" <HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>

To: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "brattin@srcinc.com" <brattin@srcinc.com>, "Borton, Eric (bortonek)" <BORTONEK@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>, "Lockey, James (lockeyje)" <lockeyje@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>, "Lemasters, Grace (lemastgj)" <LEMASTGJ@ucmail.uc.edu>, "Rice, Carol (ricech)" <ricech@ucmail.uc.edu>

Date: 11/24/2010 06:11 AM

Subject: RE: UC - EPA vermiculite data request - response 11122010

Bob,

The two workers 10395 and 14061 had X-rays at the time of their hire so

your modification of the X-ray date to 6/1/80 is fine.

There were no data entry errors regarding 17352 and 17847. We don't

have their x-rays or B-reader forms from 1980 so all we know is the diffuse/discrete determination. However, the 2004 B-reader forms for

17352 indicate pleural changes that could easily have been marked as

diffuse pleural thickening (in fact, 1 of the 3 readers did so).

We

believe 17352 still has the same pleural changes that were called diffuse pleural thickening in 1980. Regarding 17847...the discrete changes from 1980 could have been an over-call or the 2004 could have

been an under-call. In any case, he is no longer positive.

There were no technological improvements in radiographic equipment between 1980 and 2004 that would have a substantially impact on the readings. There also were no differences in overall film quality that

would have a substantial impact on the readings.

We will get back to you shortly regarding 1980 CHEEC values.

Thanks

Tim

-----Original Message-----

From: Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov

[mailto:Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 3:43 PM

To: Borton, Eric (bortonek)

Cc: brattin@srcinc.com; Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)

Subject: Re: UC - EPA vermiculite data request - response 11122010

It turns out that we also need the CHEEC calculation as of the date of

x-ray in 1980. We suggest using the CHEEC as of 05/31/1980 to match the

seasonal work schedule.

You can either do the full 513 or re-do only those with asbestos other =

0 and job-stop >06/01/1980. Your choice. My count shows the later

to

be  $n = 271$ .

I hope this will be our final request for data. We are getting close to

an exposure-response model that we think will work.

We noted there were two workers (#10395 and #14061) who were not hired

until 06/01/1980, but were included in the 513, so we modified the x-ray

date to 06/01/1980. Please check the records for the hire dates for

these two.

We also noted two discrepancies when comparing the health endpoint in

1980 versus 2004. See list below.

- #17352 diffuse in 1980; no radiographic change in 2004

- #17847 discrete in 1980, no radiographic change in 2004

Please check whether there is a data entry error or a difference in diagnosis by the readers.

When we were talking with NCEA last week a question came up about the

quality of the films and x-ray equipment in 2004 versus 1980. This is a

question for Jim:

- Were there improvements made between 1980 and 2004 that would have

- a substantial effect on the reliability of the diagnosis in 1980?